

## ETHEL KATHERINE CRUM

It is with regret that we announce the death of Miss Ethel Crum, Secretary to the Editorial Board of Madroño and Assistant Curator of the Herbarium of the University of California. She passed away on January 5, 1943, at her family home in Lexington, Illinois. Her botanical career began with the attainment of the degree of Master of Arts at the University of California in 1929 and her appointment as research assistant to Dr. W. L. Jepson at the time that the manuscript for volume two of "A Flora of California" was in preparation. She assisted in the organization of the material for many of the larger genera in this volume but adopted as her own, the genus *Potentilla*, the manuscript of which was accepted with some revisions. Further evidence of her work may be noted in the Capparidaceae and in the Leguminosae. In 1933 she accepted a position on the curatorial staff of the Herbarium of the University of California where she remained until her death. Here, in addition to her duties, she interested herself in the genera *Monolopia* and *Pseudobahia* and for the Editorial Board of Madroño she assumed the burden of editing and preparing manuscript for the printer. It is in this capacity that she made her most significant contribution to botany. Her early training in the classics, her command of the English language and her experience in handling manuscript combined to make her particularly suited to these tasks.

Her ideas of editorial procedure were well conceived and fairly consistently adhered to. She believed that the first function of an editor of a botanical journal is to protect the author from himself by preventing him where possible from making hasty and unconsidered statements, from being misinterpreted or misunderstood because of his lax use of grammar and from injecting personalities into an article to the point of creating offense. She edited to reduce the hazards of future embarrassments to the author.

She had a positive concept of where the rights of the author leave off and the rights and duties of the editor begin. These rights fluctuated only with the age and experience of the author. She believed, for instance, that the text of a manuscript, while subject to such editing as is necessary to make it conform to the style of the journal and the standard of fitness set by its editors, is the concern of the author and when once the article is accepted by the editors any changes affecting the argument or conclusions may have the effect of impeaching the author and are wholly unjustified. On the other hand, the precise wording of the title of an article should be left to the editor subject to suggestion and approval by the author. This concern stemmed from experience in the use of bibliographies wherein a tremendous amount of time is wasted investigating the subject matter of articles whose titles

MADROÑO, Vol. 7, pp. 33-64. April 28, 1943.

are inadequate or misleading. She insisted that a title should be sufficiently specific to indicate not only the subject of an article but something of its scope. She insisted that it should be expressed in language that can be readily translated into any foreign tongue and still convey its precise meaning. This entails the elimination from the title of all abbreviations and all forms of speech that are colloquialisms or professionalisms.

As to the use of footnotes, it was her firm conviction that anything worth saying in a footnote was worth incorporating into the text. Footnotes, she maintained, interrupt the continuity of thought of the reader and in addition spoil the appearance of the printed page. They should, therefore, be avoided or reduced to emergency use.

She believed that articles on isolated nomenclatorial problems were largely a waste of time and space and constantly urged the Editorial Board to adopt a rule refusing to print them unless they were written in conjunction with a monograph of the group concerned or were being used to urge the necessity of changes in or additions to the rules of botanical nomenclature. It was her further conviction that the available space in any journal is too precious in these days to waste it on preliminary taxonomic revisions and that no revision is worthy of publication until the author has completed his work upon it. She deplored the word "preliminary" because it is often taken as a promise of a more complete treatment to follow, whereas the author is content to allow his decisions to rest with the preliminary account. She argued that if the author intended that the account would be final then his use of the word "preliminary" in the title becomes a form of dishonesty and can only be construed as an excuse to cover mistakes and decisions resulting from inadequate study.

She continually urged upon young authors the avoidance of making in print promises as to the publication of future researches. Too often circumstances do not permit the fulfillment of such promises and the fact that they have been made may cause some investigator to make fruitless search of the literature. On behalf of the training of youthful and inexperienced authors she was a crusader; she would spare no effort to see to it that they were at least shown the paths of righteousness. Most of them responded in good taste and evidenced a sincere appreciation of her efforts to help them. A few have become soured on editors for life.

Her work on Madroño has set a standard of excellence in editorship the maintenance of which will serve as a challenge to her successors. She, perhaps more than any other person, has influenced its recent editorial policy.

Miss Crum was born in Lexington, Illinois, on March 13, 1886. She was educated at the University of Illinois and graduated with the class of 1907. Her education stressed English literature and

the classics. From 1909 until 1929 she taught in the public school systems of America, an experience of which she spoke as "traversing an intellectual desert of the most barren sort." This may serve to explain better than more precise words her reasons for shifting her career to botany. During the years from 1932 to 1938 she served as Secretary of the California Botanical Society, relinquishing these duties to devote more time to her work as Secretary to the Editorial Board.

Upon acquaintance one soon became impressed with the fact that Miss Crum was a woman of outstanding intellectual brilliance, that she had an engaging personality and a ready flow of wit and humor. She was devoted to her work and her several hobbies crowded one another for her attention. Her passing ends a career of uncommon usefulness; her life was a milestone in the history of a journal.—HERBERT L. MASON.

### THE XEROPHYLLOUS SPECIES OF PHILADELPHUS IN SOUTHWESTERN NORTH AMERICA

C. LEO HITCHCOCK

There are, in southwestern United States and northern Mexico, several species of *Philadelphus* which are xerophytic. These plants have a rather heavy indumentum on the lower surfaces of the leaves as well as on the calyces and on the epidermis of the twigs. Their leaves are small (1-3 cm. long), rather thick and leathery, and entire. Whereas the flowers of *Philadelphus* are usually borne in cymes or panicles of from three to many blossoms, the flowers of these members of the genus usually occur singly (rarely in two's or three's) at the ends of short leafy lateral branches. They have been placed in the group *Microphylli* by Rydberg (No. Amer. Fl. 22: 163. 1905) with no indication whether this group is of sectional or subgeneric rank. Since the precise taxonomic status of this and corresponding groups of the genus is not pertinent to this paper, the term "group" which was frequently used by Rydberg will be used.

Floristically, these small-leaved species are particularly interesting, since they occur chiefly in the lower levels of the larger mountain ranges from Texas to California. Since localized populations of each of the species are isolated by intervening deserts, geographical races have become differentiated from one another. As a unit they are readily distinguished from all other North American species of *Philadelphus*, yet it is quite apparent that they have been derived from, and are very closely related to, certain species of the *Mexicani* (Rydb. op. cit.). A general idea of the relationship of these sections as well as the geographic distribution of the *Microphylli* is expressed in the accompanying diagram (fig. 1).

Of the various species in the *Mexicani*, *Philadelphus affinis*